

22. IMPLEMENTATION

“Defense and the environment is not an either/or proposition. To choose between them is impossible in this real world of serious defense threats and genuine concerns.”³⁷

This plan is only as good as USARAK’s capability to implement it. This INRMP was prepared with a goal of 100 percent implementation. This section describes the organization, manpower, assistance, and funding needed to implement the management programs described in Chapters 12 through 20.

22-1 Organization

USARAK can implement most of this INRMP and fulfill goals and policies established in Chapter 1. Organizational changes proposed within this INRMP include the creation of an ITAM Steering Committee (Section 11-5) and the possible addition of a law enforcement capability within the

Natural Resources Branch (Section 16-6). There is also the possibility of changing responsibilities for the issuance of hunting and fishing permits if a decision is made to implement a fee-based system as is found on most installations.

22-2 Manpower

“Nobody makes a greater mistake than he who did nothing because he could only do a little.”³⁸

22-2a Staffing

Tables 22-2a(1) and 22-2a(2) indicate current staff elements within the USARAK Natural Resources Branch.

Table 22-2a(1). Personnel within the Natural Resources Branch, Primary Components Presently in Place at Fort Richardson.

Position	Responsibility
GS-12 Chief, Natural Resources Branch	Administrative supervisor for Fort Richardson, and technical supervisor for Fort Wainwright and Fort Greely natural resources
GS-11 Environmental Scientist	USARAK Pest Management Coordinator, Cultural Resources, NEPA, Permits, Habitat Rehabilitation

continued

³⁷ Defense Secretary Dick Cheney.

³⁸ Edmund Burke.

Table 22-2a(1), continued

Position	Responsibility
GS-11 Natural Resources Protection Specialist	Eagle River Flats Logistics Officer, Equipment, Supply, Maintenance, Wildlife Management
GS-7 Biological Technician	Assistant Remedial Project Manager (ERF), Watchable Wildlife, Tree City USA, Wildlife/Natural Resources Education, Wildlife Surveys
CSU Contract ITAM Project Manager	Oversight and supervision of ITAM operations at all three posts
CSU Contract Natural Resources Specialist	Assist with NEPA, POC for Land Withdrawal EIS, Clean Water Act Permits, Interagency Land Management Issues
CSU Contract GIS Specialist	Geographic Information System (GIS) oversight and project management for all three posts
CSU Contract GIS Technician	Primary user of GIS responsible for data input, data retrieval, map production and data analysis for all three posts
CSU Contract LCTA Coordinator	Responsible for LCTA program, including monitoring vegetation, collecting military land use data, managing LCTA database, analyzing data and providing information to DPTSM

Table 22-2a(2). Satellite Branch Components presently in place at Fort Wainwright and Fort Greely-Administrative supervisors by charge, but receive technical guidance from USARAK Chief, Natural Resources

Position	Responsibility
GS-11 Natural Resources Team Leader (Currently detailed to full time BRAC coordinator two year assignment)	Administratively working for Environmental Resources at Fort Wainwright, taking technical direction from the USARAK Chief, Natural Resources to administer program north-of-the-range (NOR)
GS-11 Environmental Protection Specialist (Currently assigned to Compliance Branch)	NEPA (NOR), Cultural Resources, Assistant Pest Control Coordinator, Permits, Spill Reports

continued

Table 22-2a(2), continued

Position	Responsibility
GS-7 Biological Technician	Interpretive Education Programs, Hunting, Fishing, Trapping, BASH
CSU Contract Natural Resources Specialist	Assists with forestry, fish and wildlife, and interagency land issues NOR
CSU Contract LCTA Coordinator, Fort Wainwright	Responsible for LCTA program, including monitoring vegetation, collecting military land use data, managing LCTA database, analysing data and providing information to DPTSM
CSU Contract LCTA Coordinator, Fort Greely	Responsible for LCTA program, including monitoring vegetation, collecting military land use data, managing LCTA database, analysing data and providing information to DPTSM

Additional Personnel Required:

- (1) GS 11 Natural Resources Specialist (Full-time permanent)
- (2) GS 9 Lead Conservation Law Enforcement Officers
- (6) GS 5/7 Conservation Law Enforcement Officers
- (1) WG 10 Heavy Equipment Operator (Temporary-fall-winter-spring seasonal)

Nine personnel are directly involved with natural resources management on Fort Richardson within the Natural Resources Branch. Only four are full-time, permanent employees.

Six of the nine people within the Natural Resources Branch at Fort Richardson also have extensive USARAK responsibilities for support of Fort Wainwright and Fort Greely. This makes it impossible for the existing staff to implement this INRMP for Fort Richardson and at the same time ensure implementation of INRMPs for the other two installations. A senior natural resources position is needed at Fort Richardson to handle wildlife, forestry, recreation, and NEPA assignments.

It is the current trend throughout the military to install civilian wildlife/conservation officers in positions formerly held by military police. This, for the most part, has resulted in significant improvements and increased efficiency in operations of natural resources programs.

The USARAK wildlife/natural resources enforcement program over the last 15 years has vacillated between fair and unsatisfactory. Coordination between the PMO wildlife section and USARAK Natural Resources has been tenuous, at best, largely due to separate administrative authorities. The military wildlife section is controlled by Law Enforcement Command with no direct lines to the Natural Resources Branch. This sets the stage for an inefficient working relationship. Communication between the two entities is sporadic, and in most cases, USARAK natural resources personnel have no idea what enforcement personnel are doing.

This has been an ongoing problem throughout the military, which is why many MACOMs and installations are going to a civilian force. The ideal situation is to have a civilian conservation enforcement section administratively supervised by the Natural Resources Branch with an established connection

to the LEC for backup support when needed. This is being proposed to adequately implement this INRMP.

The addition of a temporary, seasonal heavy equipment operator dedicated to natural resources management support is essential to implementation of this INRMP, especially moose habitat improvement. In order to provide for integration of this mission within the DPW organization, this person would be assigned to work within the Roads and Grounds Department. The position is funded from ERD, which will provide projects, priorities, and regular project oversight through the Chief, Roads and Grounds Department.

The ITAM program is being managed from Fort Richardson, which is consistent with the organization within USARAK. Specifically, the GIS and program management are located at Fort Richardson. Thus, USARAK will have program oversight within DPTSM via an ITAM Coordinator, a program manager for all of Alaska, a GIS Operator and a GIS Technician for all of Alaska; and a LCTA Coordinator for Fort Richardson. Both Fort Wainwright and Fort Greely have on-site LCTA coordinators. All positions are filled with CSU personnel.

While it is possible to hire educated and fully qualified term and contract personnel, these individuals do not have the local knowledge and experience of full-time, permanent employees that is required to maintain continuity within the natural resources program. High turnover rates, in addition to the time and expense of on-the-job training is detrimental to the efficient operation of the program.

22-2b Personnel Training

New enforcement officers will attend the full 11 weeks of law enforcement training (basic plus USFWS special training) at FLETC in Georgia. Enforcement personnel will qualify with personal sidearms twice annually and shotguns once annually. Officers will have a minimum of 40 hours of refresher training annually, preferably at the National Military Fish and Wildlife Association (NMFWA) course.

Each year, USARAK will send at least one Natural Resources person to each of the following annual workshops or professional conferences:

- ▶ National Military Fish and Wildlife Association annual workshop (NMFWA)
- ▶ AEC Environmental / Natural Resources Workshop
- ▶ North American Natural Resources Conference
- ▶ ITAM / LRAM / LCTA Workshop
- ▶ The Wildlife Society Conference
- ▶ National Agronomy and Soil Science Conference

Other conferences/workshops will be evaluated for their usefulness, and decisions will be made based on applicability to ongoing projects and funding availability. Projects that are especially useful include northern furbearer and predator workshops, GIS basic and advanced training, Watchable Wildlife workshops, wetlands training, endangered species training, and Partners in Flight. It is especially useful to have as many persons as possible attend the NMFWA workshops, and efforts will be made to have more than minimal attendance at that meeting.

Personnel will also be trained in related environmental fields. NEPA training will be required of all supervisory personnel as well as others who review or prepare NEPA documents. If law enforcement personnel are hired, they will be required to attend spill response and historic resources enforcement training. GIS personnel will attend the most appropriate training available to stay current with this rapidly advancing field. This training will preferably be at sites where other GIS operators from military reservations attend. All professional personnel within the Natural Resources Branch will be expected to attend at least a basic GIS course to learn the capabilities of the system.

22-2c Outside Assistance

Implementation of this INRMP will require active assistance from USARAK's partners, both signatory and otherwise. Chapter 5 indicates agencies, organizations, and others in this category. Specific needs from organizations external to Fort Richardson are indicated throughout this document.

It is impossible for USARAK to hire the special-

ized expertise needed for some projects within this INRMP. USARAK will require considerable expertise from universities, agencies, and contractors to accomplish some tasks purposed in this plan. USARAK will reimburse parties for much of their assistance.

22-3 Project/Program Priorities

Preparation and implementation of INRMPs are required by the Sikes Act and Department of Army policy, and therefore, are high priority for funding, according to OMB Circular A-106 rules. The fact that this INRMP is a Federal Facilities Compliance Agreement with action required in a published NEPA document also mandates its funding. A number of programs described in this INRMP are required for compliance with other laws and executive orders, especially where pollution prevention, restoration, wetlands, etc. are involved. However, it is unlikely that all programs described in this INRMP will be funded immediately. Sections 22-3a, b and c below define the relative importance of specific projects and programs included within this INRMP along with estimated time schedules.

Funding restrictions could result in lower priority-projects being implemented before higher priority-projects. Some high-priority projects are critical, but may not be driven by compliance requirements, making them more difficult to fund. The projects/programs listed below are based upon need and their effect on Fort Richardson's natural resources, not the likelihood of funding.

22-3a High Priority Projects/Programs

- ▶ Implement an Ecosystem Management philosophy (11) 1998–2003
- ▶ Establish Ecosystem Management partnerships (11-4) 1998–2003
- ▶ Establish an ITAM Steering Committee (11-5c) 1998
- ▶ Develop an ITAM Action Plan (11-5d) 1998–99
- ▶ Develop a Habitat Management Action Plan (11-6b and 14-3) 1998–1999
- ▶ Develop a Wetland Management Action Plan (11-6b and 14-9) 1998–1999
- ▶ Develop a Wildlife Inventory and Monitoring Action Plan (11-6b) 1998–99
- ▶ Develop a Forest Management Action Plan (11-7b) 1998–99
- ▶ Restore the ERF ecosystem (11-8) 1998–2003
- ▶ Comply with Coastal Management Zone requirements (11-9) 1998–2003
- ▶ Collect and analyze LCTA data (12-3a) 1998–2003
- ▶ Complete the wetlands inventory (12-3d) 1998
- ▶ Complete the soil survey (12-3f) 1998
- ▶ Complete the vegetation mapping (12-3h) 1998
- ▶ Monitor moose (12-4a(1)) 1998–2003
- ▶ Groundwater quality monitoring (12-5b) 1998–2003
- ▶ More intensive use of GIS for analyses (12-6c) 1998–2003
- ▶ Complete and update the GIS databases (12-6c) 1998–2003
- ▶ Site projects and military missions on lands best suited for them (13-3b) 1998–2003
- ▶ Enforce environmental restrictions within training regulations (13-3c) 1998–2003
- ▶ Identify unique or special natural areas that need protection (13-5) 1998–2003
- ▶ Protect areas of special significance (13-5) 1998–2003
- ▶ Develop a Special Interest Areas Conservation Action Plan (13-5) 1998–99
- ▶ Implement a forest ecosystem management program (14-2) 1998–2003
- ▶ Prevent/control forest diseases/insects (14-2g) 1998–2003

- ▶ Implement moose habitat management (14-3a(1)) 1998–2003
- ▶ Implement a fencing policy (14-3b) 1998–2003
- ▶ Manage hunting and fishing harvest (14-4b) 1998–2003
- ▶ Manage furbearers (14-6) 1998–2003
- ▶ Stock fish (14-8b) 1998–2003
- ▶ Manage wetlands (14-9) 1998–2003
- ▶ Complete wetlands functions/values study (14-9) 1998
- ▶ Protect water quality (14-10) 1998–2003
- ▶ Rehabilitate training areas (14-11b) 1998–2003
- ▶ Repair road drainages (14-12) 1998–2003
- ▶ Develop an Erosion Control Action Plan (Section 14-12) 1998–99
- ▶ Control pest animals (14-15b) 1998–2003
- ▶ Implement an Installation Pest Management Plan (14-15c(1)) 1998–2003
- ▶ Reduce use of pesticide/herbicide (14-15c(2)) 1998–2003
- ▶ Certify and maintain certification of pesticide applicators (14-15c(3)) 1998–2003
- ▶ Conduct priority 1 research/special projects (15-3) 1998–2003
- ▶ Conduct and improve natural resources law enforcement (16-7) 1998–2003
- ▶ Support professional communications (17-9) 1998–2003
- ▶ Develop an Outdoor Recreation Action Plan (18) 1998–99
- ▶ Manage hunters, trappers, and anglers (18-4) 1998–2003
- ▶ Evaluate a fee permit system (18-4c(2)) 1998–2003
- ▶ Manage other natural resources outdoor recreation (18-5) 1998–2003
- ▶ Update the ORV Plan (18-5b) 1997–98
- ▶ Protect cultural resources while implementing INRMP (19-3) 1998–2003
- ▶ The Natural Resources Branch will review NEPA documents (20-3) 1998–2003
- ▶ Use NEPA mitigation more effectively (20-3) 1998–2003
- ▶ EA on INRMP (20-4) 1998
- ▶ Work to resolve biopolitical and unresolved issues (21) 1998–2003
- ▶ Obtain/realign manpower to implement this INRMP (22-2a) 1998–2003
- ▶ Provide personnel training (22-2c) 1998–2003
- ▶ Obtain funding to implement this INRMP (22-4) 1998–2003
- ▶ Provide command support to implement this INRMP (22-6) 1998–2003

22-3b Important Projects/Programs

- ▶ Update the floristic survey using LCTA (12-3c) 1998–2003
- ▶ Complete the old growth forest study (12-3e) 1998
- ▶ Monitor fish in lakes (12-4a(2)) 1998–2003
- ▶ Monitor neotropical birds (12-4c) 1998–2003
- ▶ Conduct waterfowl and other bird surveys (12-4d) 1998–2003
- ▶ Complete furbearer, bear, and raven study (12-4e) 1998–99
- ▶ Implement a small mammal study (12-4e) 1998–99
- ▶ Routine computer upgrades (12-6a and 12-6b) 1998–2003
- ▶ Prepare a training map (12-6c(3)) 1998
- ▶ Implement the ITAM Environmental Awareness program (13-2) 1998–2003

- ▶ Prevent and suppress wildfires (13-4) 1998–2003
- ▶ Develop a Fire Management Action Plan (13-4) 1998–99
- ▶ Control cantonment area spruce bark beetle infestation (14-2g and 14-13a(2)) 1998–2003
- ▶ Convert alder and bluejoint grass to more desirable species (14-3a(3)) 1998–2003
- ▶ Malemute Drop Zone maintenance (14-11d) 1998–2003
- ▶ Implement a landscaping program (14-13a(1)) 1998–2003
- ▶ Develop a Landscape Management Action Plan (14-13) 1998-99
- ▶ Reduce grounds maintenance (14-13b) 1998–2003
- ▶ Control bluejoint grass (14-15a) 1998–2003
- ▶ Control noxious weeds (14-15a) 1998–2003
- ▶ Conduct priority 2 research/special projects (15-3) 1998–2003
- ▶ Effectively use newspapers (17-2) 1998–2003
- ▶ Effectively use television and radio(17-3) 1998–2003
- ▶ Enhance the Wildlife Museum and other interpretative facilities (17-5) 1998–2003
- ▶ Develop an interpretative brochure/video (17-5) 1998–99
- ▶ Develop a McVeigh Marsh viewing area (17-5) 1998–99
- ▶ Implement the Watchable Wildlife program (17-6) 1998–2003
- ▶ Develop a Watchable Wildlife Action Plan (17-6) 1998–99
- ▶ Construct barriers to reduce trespass (18-4b) 1998–2003

- ▶ Improve the check-in/checkout system (18-4c(3)) 1998
- ▶ Update the hunting and fishing map (18-4c(5)) 1998–99
- ▶ Provide safety briefings (18-4c(6)) 1998–2003
- ▶ Implement firewood and Christmas tree program (18-5c) 1998–2003
- ▶ Develop Site Summit for recreation (18-5h) 1998–99

22-3c Less Important Projects/Programs

- ▶ Establish and maintain artificial nest boxes (14-3a(4)) 1998–2003
- ▶ Fertilize willow (14-3a(5)) 1998–2003
- ▶ Set out salt and mineral blocks for wildlife (14-3a(7)) 1998–2003
- ▶ Enhance aquatic habitat (14-3b) 1998–2003
- ▶ Complete raven study (14-7) 1997
- ▶ Develop neotropical bird management plan (14-7) 1999–2000
- ▶ Transplant ruffed grouse (14-8a) 1998–2003
- ▶ Conduct priority 3 research/special projects (15-3) 1998–2003
- ▶ Celebrate Arbor Day (17-4) 1998–2003
- ▶ Support youth activities (17-7) 1998–2003

22-4 Funding Options

Murphy's Golden Rule - Whoever has the gold makes the rules.

Until the latter part of the 1980s, natural resources funding was primarily Operations and Maintenance (O&M) money within DPW. As environmental funds (internally fenced O&M) increased and regular O&M funding decreased, natural resources projects came to rely more heavily upon other sources. Below are general discussions about dif-

ferent available sources of funding to implement this INRMP.

22-4a Forestry Funds

Forestry funds are generated from sale of forest products on military lands and are centrally controlled by the DOD. USARAK may be reimbursed for all costs associated with the maintenance and disposition of forest products. Forestry funds must be used only for projects directly related to forest ecosystem management. Such projects include timber management, reforestation, timber stand improvement, inventories, fire protection, construction and maintenance of timber area access roads, purchase of forestry equipment, disease and insect control, planning (including compliance with laws), marking, inspections, sales preparations, personnel training, and sales. DA Regulation AR 200-3 (Chapter 5) outlines collection and expenditures systems.

Proceeds from forest product sales that exceed reimbursably incurred expenses will be split 60:40 between the DOD Forestry Reserve Account and the State of Alaska. The account, administered by the Secretary of Defense, may be used for: (1) improvements of forest lands, (2) unanticipated contingencies in the administration of forest lands and the maintenance and disposition of forest products for which no other funding sources are immediately available, and (3) natural resource management that implements approved plans and agreements. The State of Alaska may use its portion of proceeds for the benefit of public schools and public roads.

Forestry funds can only be generated from the sale of timber on military-owned land. The sale of timber on withdrawn lands is managed by the BLM, with sales receipts deposited in the U.S. Treasury.

USARAK does not expect to generate any forestry funds in 1998–2003, but will explore and evaluate any potential for deriving revenue from future sales of firewood, landscaping materials, and salvage timber.

22-4b Fish and Wildlife Funds

Fish and wildlife funds are collected through sales of permits for hunting and fishing on military controlled lands. They are authorized by the Sikes Act and regulated via AR 200-3, Chapter 6. These funds may be used only for fish and wildlife management on the installation where they are collected. They cannot be used for recreational activities. They are exempt from the BCE cap, and have no year-end spending requirement (unobligated funds carry over each year on 1 October).

To date, USARAK has not taken advantage of this funding source. The option, which is discussed in Section 18-4c(2), is currently being evaluated. If adopted, it could provide approximately \$20,000 for implementation of this INRMP during 1998–2003 if a fee-based permit system is established.

22-4c Environmental Funding

Environmental funds are a special category of O&M's budget. They are controlled by the Environmental Program Requirements (EPR) process. They are special in that they are fenced by DOD, but are still subject to restrictions of O&M funds.

“Must fund” classifications include mitigation identified within Findings of No Significant Impact (FONSI), items required within Federal Facilities Compliance Agreements, and planning level surveys. This INRMP is a Federal Facilities Requirement Agreement, that contains projects and programs which mitigate various military activities.

Table 22-4c indicates Environmental Program requirements needed to implement this INRMP. Projects concerning pest management and Eagle River Flats restoration are not included in this listing. The total environmental fund budget for this INRMP is estimated at \$9,067,000 for 1998–2003. These estimates will be adjusted as needed each year.

Table 22-4c. Environmental Program Requirements Projects.*

Project	FY 98	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02
Program Management	250	250	275	275	300
INRMP Planning	75	75	75	300	75
Erosion Control Action Plan		40			
Forest Mgmt Action Plan		45			
Wetland Mgmt Action Plan	35				
Key Species/T&E Planning Level Surveys	95				
Archaeological Planning Level Survey	100				
Historic Planning Level Survey	30				
Prepare NEPA Documentation	250	250	250	250	250
Monitor Ice Depths Eagle River Flats	25	25	25	25	25
Erosion Control	50	50	50	50	50
Wetlands Management and Revegetation	30	30	30	30	30
Tree City, USA	50	50	50	50	50
Spruce Bark Beetle Rehabilitation	91				
Emergency Stabilization of Site Summit Battery Control Building	131				
Watchable Wildlife	50	50	50	50	50
Moose fencing	250	250	250	250	250
Natural and Cultural Resource Education and Awareness	25	25	25	25	25
Habitat Management	50	50	50	50	50
Establish Site Protection for NIKE Missile Site	40	40	40	40	40

continued

Table 22-4c continued

Project	FY 98	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02
Manage Recreationial Use Impacts	50	50	50	50	50
Monitor Recreational Use to Assess Impacts	30	30	30	30	30
Conduct Fish and Wildlife Monitoring	35	35	35	35	35
Fish and Wildlife Population Management	25	25	25	25	25
Administer Hunting and Fishing Harvest	250	250	250	250	250
Forest Inventory	35	35	35	35	35
Forest/Ecosystem Management	40	40	40	40	40
Totals	2,092	1,695	1,620	1,845	1,815

* Funding in thousands of dollars

22-4d Training Funds

In FY 95, proponenty for the ITAM program was transferred from Environmental to Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff, Operations and Plans (ODCSOPS), the military training side of the Army. Training funds set aside for ITAM are not internally fenced as are environmental funds.

Together, Fort Richardson, and the other two Alaska Army posts, are classified as Category I installa-

tions. Category I installations are estimated to have average annual ITAM costs of \$1,036,000 with the understanding that special circumstances may dictate changes in these numbers (which must be justified). Instructions for the ITAM budget submittal (ODCSOPS, 1995a) state that ITAM funding requests will not contain projects which fall within Conservation Compliance. The total USARAK ITAM Program budget as required for FY 98 through FY 02 (shown in Table 22-4d), is \$6,046,000.

Table 22-4d. Budget requirements for ITAM Projects.*

Project	FY 98	FY 98	FY 98	FY 98	FY 98
LRAM	499	732	765	761	760
EA	46	3	3	3	3
TRI	202	125	100	110	110
LCTA/GIS	461	353	335	336	339
Totals	1,208	1,213	1,203	1,210	1,212

* Funding in thousands of dollars

^ Funding includes projects that also support Fort Greely and Fort Wainwright ITAM

22-4e Other Funding

Other sources of funding for the natural resources program are no longer available. The Legacy Program, which was a source of money for natural resources projects, is no longer funded by Congress. The law authorizing the program is still in effect, however, and this allows the DOD to enter into cooperative agreements to conduct projects that “implement the purposes of the Legacy Resources Management Program” (see P.L. 101-511 [FY 91 Appropriations Act, Sec. 8120]), whether or not separately earmarked Legacy money is available. USARAK intends to use such cooperative agreements during 1998–2003. These agreements can be found in Appendix 5-10.

The natural resources program is often benefited by other environmental projects. ERF restoration, as the best example, has provided much information on the function and description of one of Fort Richardson’s most important ecosystems. The restoration project, most importantly, will reduce the loss of waterfowl and other species, a direct benefit to the natural resources program. The integration of natural resources and other environmental programs provides indirect funding to support the overall natural resources program.

22-5 INRMP Implementation Costs

Specific costs for each program and project are difficult to predict, especially considering that future events affect many programs. The average annual costs below are estimated by categories of potential funding sources:

Forestry: \$0

Fish and Wildlife: \$0 unless a permit system is in-

stalled

Environmental: \$1,341,200 for projects that qualify for environmental funding

Training: \$1,209,200 for ITAM.

Average annual funding to implement this INRMP will be \$2,550,400. The five-year cost of implementing this INRMP will likely be about \$12,752,000.

Above figures do not include costs incurred by related organizations such as PMO and Outdoor Recreation, nor do they include costs incurred by other agencies such as ADF&G and BLM. Some funds listed above, however, are to be used in support of programs administered by other organizations and agencies. In some instances, it is difficult to determine which costs are natural resources and which are environmental since the two are so closely related at Fort Richardson. Pest management costs are not included.

22-6 Command Support

Command support is essential to implement this INRMP. Without this support, priority projects for natural resources management will not occur. Failure to execute these projects risks violation of environmental laws, reduced mission readiness, and negative public reaction to lack of environmental stewardship. The Installation Commander is responsible for compliance with environmental laws and sets the tone for environmental stewardship. This INRMP meets the requirements of the Sikes Act. Command emphasis on this INRMP ensures a healthy environment, sustainable resources, and future quality training lands.